arXiv:1305.0478v1 [math.AC] 2 May 2013

# Parametrizations, hyperplane sections, Hough transforms

Lorenzo Robbiano

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Genova, Via Dodecaneso 35, I-16146 Genova, Italy*

## Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to extend the classical Hough Transforms (HT for short) to general algebraic schemes.

Initially, following some ideas presented in [6], we develop an algorithmic approach to decide whether a parametrization is rational.

Then we concentrate on hyperplane sections of algebraic families, and present some new theoretical results for determining when a given parametrization via reduced Gröbner bases passes to the quotient. The main obstacle is the fact that we deal with non-homogeneous ideals. As a by-product we hint at a promising technique for computing implicitizations quickly.

In the last part of the paper we apply our techniques to the HT; the main application being the detection of Hough superregularity. Then we compute the dimension of the HT, and show that in some interesting cases it is a finite set of points.

Finally, we apply the results about hyperplane sections to families of algebraic schemes and their HTs. These last results hint at the possibility of reconstructing external and internal surfaces of human organs from the parallel cross-sections obtained by tomography.

*Keywords:* Parametrization, Hyperplane, Hough transform, Gröbner basis, Family of schemes.
*2010 MSC:* 13P25, 13P10, 14D06

> *it is a miracle that curiosity*
> *survives formal education*
> (Albert Einstein)

## Introduction

The main motivation of the research described in this paper comes from the challenge of recognizing and reconstructing images from various types of tomography. About 50 years ago the technique of Hough Transforms (HT for short) was introduced for this task; it has subsequently become widely used. However, its range of application is very limited. A first extension was presented in [6] where the HT was introduced in the wider context of families of algebraic schemes. This paved the way to detecting more complicated objects, and offered the prospect of using algebraic geometry to help other scientists, in particular doctors.

We commence our investigation by proving a generalized version of [6, Theorem 4.3] which provides a theoretical and computational tool (see Theorem 1.5) to determine whether a given

---

*Email address:* `robbiano@dima.unige.it` (Lorenzo Robbiano)

*Preprint submitted to Journal of Algebra: section on Computational Algebra* *May 3, 2013*

parametrization is rational or not. This tool, which is by itself important in classical algebraic geometry, is applied later in the paper to the detection of Hough superregularity (see Corollary 3.17).

In the second section we consider hyperplane sections. It is well-known how to use the `DegRevLex` term ordering to relate Gröbner bases of a homogenous ideal to Gröbner bases of its quotient modulo a linear form (see for instance [7] and Theorem 2.4). However, that result makes essential use of the homogeneity. Since we have in mind inhomogeneous applications we develop an analogous result in the theory of Gröbner bases which works in the inhomogenous case. First of all we prove a result (see Theorem 2.9) which shows how Gröbner bases pass to the quotient, and then Theorem 2.11 establishes a criterion for lifting Gröbner bases. An important consequence of this result is Theorem 2.18 which describes a wide class of instances where a special lifting of a Gröbner basis can be obtained. A confirmation of its usefulness comes from some preliminary experiments on computing implicitizations. The speed-up of the algorithm was significant (see Example 2.20), and we plan to devote another paper to this specific problem.

The final section applies our new techniques developed to the theory of HT. Since there is a non-empty Zariski open set over which the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis $G$ specializes to the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of the fibers, we get a parametrization of the fibers via the non-constant coefficients of $G$ (see Theorem 3.9). The scheme which parametrizes the fibers is called the $\sigma$-scheme, and from the theory of Gröbner fans (see [9]) we deduce that each family has only a finite set of $\sigma$-schemes (see Corollary 3.12). Then we introduce the notion of superregularity of the HT (see Definition 3.15), and using the results of the first section we show that there is an algorithm to detect superregularity (see Corollary 3.17 and Example 3.18).

In Subsection 3.2 we show how to compute the dimension of the HT. Corollary 3.21 and the subsequent examples illustrate the cases when the HTs are zero-dimensional schemes, which greatly simplifies the process of detecting special curves inside images. The last part of the paper, Subsection 3.3, applies the results about hyperplane sections; a typical result is Proposition 3.27.

Finally, we hint at a potential application of Theorem 2.18. Remember that we mentioned other scientists, in particular doctors. Why? The reason is that we aim at using our method in the reconstruction of surfaces from a finite set of parallel sections. In particular, when special curves have been recognized in the tomographic sections, our results show how one can reconstruct the equation of a surface whose cross-sections coincide with the curves recognized. For example, it could be the contour of a vertebra or a kidney. As usual, our new results pose new questions and challenges.

My warmest thanks go to John Abbott, Mauro Beltrametti, Michele Piana. With them I had the opportunity to share my ideas and from them I received valuable feed-back.

## Contents

**1 Rational Parametrizations** **3**

**2 Hyperplane Sections** **5**
2.1 The non-Homogeneous Case . . . . . . . . . . 6
2.2 Lifting . . . . . . . . . . 8

**3 Families of Schemes and the Hough Transform** **10**
3.1 The Hough Transform . . . . . . . . . . 13
3.2 The Dimension of the Hough Transforms . . . . . . . . . . 14
3.3 Hyperplane Sections and Hough Transforms . . . . . . . . . . 16

**References** **17**

## 1. Rational Parametrizations

We start by recalling some definitions and results from [6] and extend them.

**Assumptions 1.1.** *Let $K$ be an algebraically closed field, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_s)$ be indeterminates, let $p_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, p_s(\mathbf{a}), d_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, d_s(\mathbf{a})$ be non-zero polynomials in the ring $K[\mathbf{a}]$, and let $\mathrm{lcm}(d_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, d_s(\mathbf{a}))$ be denoted by $d(\mathbf{a})$. Then let $\mathbb{X}$ be the affine sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^s$ which is represented parametrically by $y_i = \frac{p_i(\mathbf{a})}{d_i(\mathbf{a})}$, let $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{A}^m \setminus \{d(\mathbf{a}) = 0\}$, and denote the parametrization $(\frac{p_1(\mathbf{a})}{d_1(\mathbf{a})}, \dots, \frac{p_s(\mathbf{a})}{d_s(\mathbf{a})})$ by $\mathcal{P}$.*

**Definition 1.2.** We say that $\mathcal{P}$ is injective (generically injective) if the corresponding morphism of schemes $\Phi : \mathcal{U} \longrightarrow \mathbb{X}$ is injective (generically injective). In other words, $\mathcal{P}$ is injective if $(\frac{p_1(\alpha)}{d_1(\alpha)}, \dots, \frac{p_s(\alpha)}{d_s(\alpha)}) = (\frac{p_1(\eta)}{d_1(\eta)}, \dots, \frac{p_s(\eta)}{d_s(\eta)})$ implies $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$, it is **generically injective** if the same property holds on a non-empty open sub-scheme.

**Definition 1.3.** If $\dim(\mathbb{X}) = m$ we say that $\mathcal{P}$ provides a **uni-rational representation** of $\mathbb{X}$. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a generically injective parametrization, we say that it provides a **rational parametrization** of $\mathbb{X}$.

**Definition 1.4.** We adopt Assumptions 1.1 and double the tuple **a** by considering a new tuple of indeterminates $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_m)$. Then we define two ideals in $K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e}]$, the ideal $I(Doub)$ generated by $\{p_1(\mathbf{a})d_1(\mathbf{e}) - p_1(\mathbf{e})d_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, p_s(\mathbf{a})d_s(\mathbf{e}) - p_s(\mathbf{e})d_s(\mathbf{a})\}$ called the **ideal of doubling coefficients of** $\mathcal{P}$, and the ideal $I(\Delta)$ generated by $\{a_1 - e_1, \dots, a_m - e_m\}$ called the **diagonal ideal**. Moreover, if $f(\mathbf{a})$ is a non-zero element of $K[\mathbf{a}]$, we denote the extensions of the ideals $I(Doub)$ and $I(\Delta)$ to the localization $K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e}]_{f(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{e})}$ by $I(Doub)_{f(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{e})}$ and $I(\Delta)_{f(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{e})}$ respectively.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Under Assumptions 1.1, let $0 \neq f(\mathbf{a}) \in K[\mathbf{a}]$, let $h(\mathbf{a}) = d(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{a})$, and let $S(\Delta)$ be the saturation of $I(Doub)$ with respect to $I(\Delta)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

*(a) The ideal $I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$ is contained in the radical of the ideal $I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$.*
*(b) The ideal $I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$ coincides with the radical of the ideal $I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$.*
*(c) We have $S(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} = (1)$.*

(d) *If* $\mathcal{U}_f$ *denotes* $\mathcal{U} \setminus \{f(\mathbf{a}) = 0\}$*, then* $\Phi_{|\mathcal{U}_f} : \mathcal{U}_f \longrightarrow \mathbb{X}$ *is injective.*

*Proof.* We observe that (a) and (c) are equivalent since saturation commutes with localization. Moreover, we observe that $I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} \subseteq I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$ and that $I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$ is a prime ideal. Therefore, if (a) is satisfied we have $I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} \subseteq I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} \subseteq \sqrt{I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}}$. Passing to the radicals we get the chain of inclusions $\sqrt{I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}} \subseteq I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} \subseteq \sqrt{I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}}$ which proves that (a) implies (b). The implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) is obvious, hence it remains to be shown that (a) is equivalent to (d). It is clear that $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ and $(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_m)$ yield the same point in $\mathbb{X}$ if and only if $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_m)$ is a zero of the ideal $I(Doub)$. Consequently, condition (d) is equivalent to the zero set of $I(Doub)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$ being contained in the zero set of $I(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})}$. Since $K$ is algebraically closed, the Nullstellensatz implies that this condition is equivalent to (a), and the proof is complete. ☐

**Proposition 1.6.** *The following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *The morphism* $\Phi$ *is generically injective i.e.* $\mathcal{P}$ *provides a rational representation of* $\mathbb{X}$*.*
(b) *There exists a polynomial* $f(\mathbf{a}) \in K[\mathbf{a}]$ *such that, if* $\mathcal{U}_f$ *denotes* $\mathcal{U} \setminus \{f(\mathbf{a}) = 0\}$ *then the restriction* $\Phi_{|\mathcal{U}_f} : \mathcal{U}_f \longrightarrow \mathbb{X}$ *is injective.*

*Moreover, the following property holds.*

(c) *If* $S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}] \neq (0)$ *and* $f(\mathbf{a})$ *is a non-zero polynomial in* $S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}]$*, then* $f(\mathbf{a})$ *satisfies condition (b).*

*Proof.* The implication (b) implies (a) is obvious. If (a) is satisfied, then there exists a non-empty open sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^m$ such that the restriction of $\Phi$ to it is injective, hence there exist an open sub-scheme of type $\mathbb{A}^m \setminus \{d(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{a}) = 0\} = \mathcal{U} \setminus \{f(\mathbf{a}) = 0\}$ with the same property, and so the equivalence of (a) and (b) is proved.

To prove (c), let $0 \neq f(\mathbf{a}) \in S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}]$, and let $h(\mathbf{a}) = d(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{a})$. Then $S(\Delta)_{f(\mathbf{a})} = (1)$, and so $S(\Delta)_{h(\mathbf{a})h(\mathbf{e})} = (1)$. The conclusion follows from the equivalence between (c) and (d) of Theorem 1.5. ☐

**Remark 1.7.** The above theorem and proposition yield criteria to detect whether a parametrization provides a rational representation, not to detect whether $\mathbb{X}$ is a rational scheme. For instance $x = a^2$ is not a rational representation of the affine line. If we perform the computation suggested by the theorem, we get $d(\mathbf{a}) = d(\mathbf{e}) = 1$ and $S(\Delta)_{d(\mathbf{a})d(\mathbf{e})} = S(\Delta) = (a + e) \neq (1)$. But of course the affine line is rational and can be better represented by $x = a$.

The following example illustrates the claims of the proposition.

**Example 1.8.** Let $\mathbb{X}$ be the curve in $\mathbb{A}^2$ given by the parametrization $\mathcal{P} = (a^2 - a,\ a^3 - a^2)$. In this case $\mathcal{U}$ coincides with the affine line $\mathbb{A}^1$ since there is no denominator. The parametrization is not injective, since for instance $a = 1$ and $a = 0$ yield the same point on the curve. The ideal $S(\Delta)$ is generated by $\{a + e - 1,\ e^2 - e\}$, and we get $S(\Delta) \cap K[a] = (a^2 - a)$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0, 1\}$ the map $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{X}$ defined by $\mathcal{P}$ is injective. In conclusion, $\Phi$ is not injective but it is generically injective. We observe that from $S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}]$ we do not necessarily get the best open sub-scheme over which $\Phi$ is injective. For instance in this example, if we perform the computation of $S(\Delta)_{ae}$ we get the ideal (1), hence it turns out that $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}'} : \mathcal{V}' \longrightarrow \mathbb{X}$ is injective with $\mathcal{V}' = \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$.

We have seen in Proposition 1.6 that $S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}] \neq (0)$ implies the generical injectivity of $\Phi$. The following example, motivated by the facts explained in Section 3, shows that such implication cannot be reversed.

**Example 1.9.** Let us consider the ideal of the polynomial ring $K(a_1, a_2, a_3)[x, y, z]$ generated by $\{x^2+a_1y^2+z^2,\ xy-a_2y^2-z,\ a_1yz-a_3x\}$. The reduced Gröbner basis $G$ with respect to `DegRevLex` is the following.

$$\begin{aligned}\{\, & yz - \tfrac{a_3}{a_1}x,\\ & y^2 + \tfrac{a_1+a_3}{a_2^2a_3+a_1a_3}z^2 + \tfrac{a_2}{a_2^2+a_1}z,\\ & xy + \tfrac{a_1a_2+a_2a_3}{a_2^2a_3+a_1a_3}z^2 - \tfrac{a_1}{a_2^2+a_1}z,\\ & x^2 + \tfrac{a_2^2a_3-a_1^2}{a_2^2a_3+a_1a_3}z^2 - \tfrac{a_1a_2}{a_2^2+a_1}z,\\ & z^3 - \tfrac{a_2a_3^2}{a_1^2+a_1a_3}z^2 + \tfrac{a_3^2}{a_1+a_3}z,\\ & xz^2 - \tfrac{a_2a_3^2}{a_1^2+a_1a_3}xz + \tfrac{a_3^2}{a_1+a_3}x \,\}\end{aligned}$$

We consider the parametrization $\mathcal{P}$ of the affine scheme $\mathbb{X}$ given by the non-constant coefficients of $G$. The least common multiple of the denominators is $d(\mathbf{a}) = a_1a_3(a_1 + a_3)(a_2^2 + a_1)$. The saturation of $I(Doub)$ with respect to $I(\Delta)$ is the ideal $S(\Delta)$ generated by the set

$$\begin{aligned}\{\, & a_3e_1 - a_1e_3,\quad a_1e_3^2 + a_3e_3^2,\quad a_1a_3e_3 + a_3^2e_3,\quad a_2^2e_2 - a_2e_2^2 - a_2e_1 + a_1e_2,\quad a_2^2e_1 - a_1e_2^2,\\ & a_1e_2^2e_3+a_3e_2^2e_3+a_1e_1e_3-a_3e_3^2,\quad a_1a_2^2e_3+a_2^2a_3e_3+a_1^2e_3-a_3^2e_3,\quad a_1e_2^3+a_1e_1e_2,\quad a_2e_1e_2^2+a_2e_1^2,\\ & a_1a_3e_2^2 + a_2^2a_3e_3 + a_1^2e_3 - a_3^2e_3,\quad a_1a_2e_2^2 + a_1a_2e_1,\quad a_3e_2^3e_3 - a_3e_2e_3^2,\quad a_3^2e_2^2e_3 - a_2^2a_3e_3^2,\\ & a_2a_3e_2^2e_3 - a_2a_3e_3^2,\ a_2^3a_3e_3 - a_2a_3^2e_3 \,\}\end{aligned}$$

It turns out that $S(\Delta)_{d(\mathbf{a})d(\mathbf{e})} = (1)$ which means that $\mathcal{P}$ is injective, according to the theorem. On the other hand, we have $S(\Delta) \cap K[\mathbf{a}] = (0)$. Therefore, as said before, the implication stated in the last part of Propsition 1.6 cannot be reversed.

## 2. Hyperplane Sections

In this section we conduct our investigation into hyperplane sections, and establish some results about Gröbner bases. We recall several results from the well-known homogeneous case and confront them with our new results for the inhomogenous case.

**Definition 2.1.** For $t = x_1^{a_1}x_2^{a_2}\cdots x_n^{a_n}$ we write $a_i = \log_{x_i}(t)$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we say that a term ordering $\sigma$ is of **$x_i$-DegRev type** if it is degree-compatible, and for every pair of terms $t, t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ which satisfy $\deg(t) = \deg(t')$ and $\log_{x_i}(t) < \log_{x_i}(t')$, then $t >_\sigma t'$.

The usual `DegRevLex` ordering is of $x_n$-`DegRev` type, and by suitably modifying its definition we see that for every $i$ there exist term orderings of $x_i$-`DegRev` type. For an in-depth analysis of this topic see [7, Section 4.4].

**Assumptions 2.2.** *Let $P = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let $L = x_i - \ell$ be a linear homogeneous polynomial with $\ell = \sum_{j\neq i} c_jx_j$. Then we identify $P/(L)$ with the polynomial ring $\hat{P} = K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, n]$ via the isomorphism induced by $\varphi_L(x_i) = \ell$, $\varphi_L(x_j) = x_j$ for $j \neq i$. We observe that $\varphi_L = \pi \circ \theta$ where $\theta : P \longrightarrow P$ is defined by $\theta(x_i) = x_i + \ell$, $\theta(x_j) = x_j$ for $j \neq i$ while $\pi : P \longrightarrow \hat{P}$ is defined by $\pi(x_i) = 0$, $\pi(x_j) = x_j$ for $j \neq i$.*

**Notation 2.3.** If $\sigma$ is a term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$, we call $\widehat{\sigma_i}$ or simply by $\hat{\sigma}$ (if $i$ is clear from the context) the restriction of $\sigma$ to $\mathbb{T}_{\hat{\imath}} = \mathbb{T}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, n)$.

**Proposition 2.4. (Homogeneous Hyperplane Sections)**
*Under Assumptions 2.2 let $\sigma$ be an $x_i$-`DegRev` type term ordering on $P = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, let $I$ be a homogeneous ideal in $P$, and let $G = \{G_1, \dots, G_s\}$ be the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $\theta(I)$. Then $\varphi(G) = \{\varphi(G_1), \dots, \varphi(G_s)\} \setminus \{0\}$ is the reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $\varphi(I)$.*

*Proof.* First of all we observe that $\theta$ is a graded isomorphism, so that $\theta(I)$ is a homogeneous ideal. Consequently the claim follows from a classical result in Gröbner basis theory (see for instance [7, Corollary 4.4.18]). ☐

The following examples illustrate this proposition.

**Example 2.5.** Let $P = K[x, y, z, w]$, let $I = (z^2 - xw,\ x^2y - zw^2)$, and let $\ell = 3y + w$, $L = z - \ell = z - 3y - w$. We consider the linear change of coordinates $\theta$ which sends $z$ to $z + \ell = z + 3y + w$, and $x$ to $x$, $y$ to $y$, $w$ to $w$. Then $\theta(I) = (9y^2 - xw + 6yw + w^2 + 6yz + 2zw + z^2,\ x^2y - 3yw^2 - w^3 - zw^2)$. Let $\sigma$ be of $z$-`DegRev` type. The reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $\theta(I)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} G = \{&y^2 - \tfrac{1}{9}xw + \tfrac{2}{3}yw + \tfrac{1}{9}w^2 + \tfrac{2}{3}yz + \tfrac{2}{9}wz + \tfrac{1}{9}z^2 \\ &x^2y - 3yw^2 - w^3 - w^2z, \\ &x^3w - x^2w^2 - 3xw^3 - 9yw^3 - 3w^4 - 2x^2wz - 9yw^2z - 6w^3z - x^2z^2 - 3w^2z^2\} \end{aligned}$$

If we mod out $z$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(G) = \{&y^2 - \tfrac{1}{9}xw + \tfrac{2}{3}yw + \tfrac{1}{9}w^2 \\ &x^2y - 3yw^2 - w^3, \\ &x^3w - x^2w^2 - 3xw^3 - 9yw^3 - 3w^4\} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\pi$ is defined by $\pi(x) = x$, $\pi(y) = y$, $\pi(w) = w$, $\pi(z) = 0$, and we put $\varphi_L = \pi \circ \theta$ we have $\varphi_L(I) = (9y^2 - xw + 6yw + w^2,\ x^2y - 3yw^2 - w^3)$. If we compute the $\hat{\sigma}$-reduced Gröbner basis of $\varphi_L(I)$ we get $\varphi(G)$, as prescribed by the proposition.

**Example 2.6.** Let $P = K[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3]$, let $F_1 = x_3^3 - x_1x_2x_0$, $F_2 = x_2^3 - x_1x_3x_0 - x_2x_0^2$, $F_3 = x_1^2x_2 - x_3x_0^2$, let $I = (F_1, F_2, F_3)$, and let $\sigma$ be of $x_0$-`DegRev` type. The reduced Gröbner basis of $I$ is $(F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4)$ where $f_4 = x_1^3x_3x_0 - x_2^2x_3x_0^2 + x_3x_0^4$. If we mod out $x_0$ we get $\varphi_L(F_1) = x_3^3$, $\varphi_L(F_2) = x_2^3$, $\varphi_L(F_3) = x_1^2x_2$ , $\varphi_L(F_4) = 0$. The reduced Gröbner basis of $\varphi_L(I)$ is $(\varphi_L(F_1), \varphi_L(F_2), \varphi_L(F_3))$. We have to take out $\varphi_L(F_4) = 0$.

### 2.1. *The non-Homogeneous Case*

As we have seen, the main feature of the homogeneous case is that if $\sigma$ is of $x_i$-`DegRev` type and $F$ is a non zero homogeneous polynomial then $x_i \mid F$ if and only if $x_i \mid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$. This fact implies that in Poposition 2.4 it suffices to take out 0 from $\{\varphi(G_1), \dots, \varphi(G_s)\}$, and get the reduced Gröbner basis of $\varphi(I)$ (see for instance Example 2.6). In the non homogeneous case it may happen that $x_i$ divides $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(f)$ but $x_i$ does not divide $f$. For instance, if $f = x^2 - 2y$ and $\sigma$ is any degre-compatible term ordering then $x \mid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(f) = x^2$, but $x$ does not divide $f$. These observations lead to the a different approach of the hyperplane section problem in the non homogeneous case. The difference is already visible in the next set of assumptions where $\ell = \sum_{j \geq i} c_j x_j + \gamma$ instead of $\ell = \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j$.

**Assumptions 2.7.** *Let* $P = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $c_{i+1}, \dots, c_n, \gamma \in K$, $\ell = \sum_{j>i} c_j x_j + \gamma$, *and* $L = x_i - \ell$. *Then we identify* $P/(L)$ *with the polynomial ring* $\hat{P} = K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, n]$ *via the isomorphism induced by* $\varphi_L(x_i) = \ell$, $\varphi_L(x_j) = x_j$ *for* $j \neq i$.

Unlike the homogeneous case, it is not useful to represent $\varphi_L$ as $\pi \circ \theta$.

**Notation 2.8.** If $\sigma$ is a term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$, we call $\hat{\sigma}$ the restriction of $\sigma$ to the monoid $\mathbb{T}_{\hat{\imath}} = \mathbb{T}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, n)$.

**Theorem 2.9. (Hyperplane Sections)**
*Under Assumptions 2.7 let* $\sigma$ *be a term ordering such that* $x_1 >_\sigma x_2 >_\sigma \cdots >_\sigma x_n$, *let* $I$ *be an ideal in* $P$, *let* $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_s\}$ *be a* $\sigma$*-Gröbner basis of* $I$, *and assume that* $x_i$ *does not divide zero modulo* $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I)$.

- *(a) The set* $\varphi_L(G) = \{\varphi_L(g_1), \dots, \varphi_L(g_s)\}$ *is a* $\hat{\sigma}$*-Gröbner basis of* $\varphi_L(I)$.
- *(b) If* $G$ *is the reduced* $\sigma$*-Gröbner basis of* $I$, *then* $\varphi_L(G)$ *is the reduced* $\hat{\sigma}$*-Gröbner basis of* $\varphi_L(I)$, *in particular the ideals* $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I)$ *and* $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\varphi_L(I))$ *have the same minimal set of monomial generators.*

*Proof.* We start by proving (a). It is clear that $\varphi_L(G)$ generates $\varphi_L(I)$, so we need to prove that for every non-zero element $f$ of $\varphi_L(I)$ its leading term $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(f)$ is divided by the leading term of an element of $\varphi_L(G)$. For contradiction, suppose that there exists a non-zero element $f \in \varphi_L(I)$ such that $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(f)$ is not divided by any leading term of the elements of $\varphi_L(G)$, and let $F \in I$ be such that $\varphi_L(F) = f$. The ordering $\sigma$ is a well-ordering, hence there exists such $F$ with minimal leading term. A priori there are two possibilities, either $x_i \mid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$ or $x_i \nmid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$. If $x_i \mid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$ there exist an index $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and a term $t \in \mathbb{T}_i$ such that we have $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F) = x_i \cdot t \cdot \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_j)$. We let $H = F - L \cdot t \cdot g_j$ and observe that $\varphi_L(H) = \varphi_L(F) = f$, since $\varphi_L(L) = 0$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(H) <_\sigma \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$ which contradicts the minimality of $F$. So this case is excluded and hence $x_i \nmid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$. Since $\varphi_L$ substitutes $x_i$ with a linear polynomial whose support contains only terms which are $\sigma$-smaller than $x_i$, we deduce that $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(f)$. Since we are assuming that $x_i$ does not divide zero modulo $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I)$, hence modulo $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i)$ for $1 = 1, \dots, s$, for the same reason as before we see that $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\varphi_L(g_i))$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Since there exists $j$ such that $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_j) \mid \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F)$, we deduce that $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\varphi_L(g_j)) \mid \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(f)$.

Now we prove (b). If $G$ is the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$, then the tails of the polynomials in $G$ cannot be reduced which means that the terms in the support of such tails are not divisible by any leading term. Substituting $x_i$ with $\ell$ does not affect the leading terms, as we have seen in the proof of (a), and lowers the terms in the support of the tails. Hence the tails of the elements in $\widehat{G}$ cannot be reduced and the proof is complete. ☐

An easy example shows how essential in the theorem is the assumption that $x_i$ does not divide any leading term of the elements of $G$.

**Example 2.10.** Let $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y, z, w]$, let $f_1 = yz - w$, $f_2 = x^3 - 2z^2$, let $I = (f_1, f_2)$, and let $\sigma$ be any degree-compatible term ordering. Then $(f_1, f_2)$ is the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$. If we substitute $x$ with $z + w$, and let $f_2'$ be the polynomial obtained with the substitution $x = z + w$ in $f_2$, then the reduced `DegRevLex`-Gröbner basis is $(f_1,\ f_2',\ yw^3 + z^2w + 3zw^2 + 3w^3 - 2zw)$ which differs from $(f_1, f_2')$ markedly, since it includes the **new** polynomial $yw^3 + z^2w + 3zw^2 + 3w^3 - 2zw$.

### *2.2. Lifting*

We keep using Notation 2.8 and prove a sort of converse to Theorem 2.9.

**Theorem 2.11. (Lifting)**
*Under Assumptions 2.7 let $I$ be an ideal in $P$ such that $L$ does not divide zero modulo $I$, and let $\widehat{G} = \{\hat{g}_1, \ldots, \hat{g}_s\}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $I_L$. Moreover, let $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_s\}$ be a tuple of polynomials in $I$ such that $\varphi(g_i) = \hat{g}_i$ and $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Then we have the following facts.*

- *(a) The set $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_s\}$ is a $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$.*
- *(b) If $\widehat{G}$ is the reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $J$, then $G$ is the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$.*

*Proof.* The proof uses affine Hilbert functions, and we refer to [7, Section 5.6] for the most important definitions and properties. To begin with, we let $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G)$, $LT_{\hat{\sigma}}(\widehat{G})$ be the ideals generated by $\{\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_1), \ldots, \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G_s)\}$, $\{\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_1), \ldots, \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_s)\}$ respectively, and consider the following sequence of relations. For simplicity we use $I_L$ instead of $\varphi_L(I)$.

$$\mathrm{HS}^a(\hat{P}/I_L) \overset{(1)}{=} \frac{\mathrm{HS}^a(P/I)}{1-z} \overset{(2)}{=} \frac{\mathrm{HS}^a(P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I))}{1-z} \overset{(3)}{\leq} \frac{\mathrm{HS}^a(P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G))}{1-z} \overset{(4)}{\leq} \mathrm{HS}^a(\hat{P}/\,\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\widehat{G})) \overset{(5)}{=} \mathrm{HS}^a(\hat{P}/I_L)$$

where equalities and inequalities are intended to be coefficientwise. By assumption we have $I_L \cong (I + (L))/(L)$ and $L$ does not divide zero modulo $I$, hence we get equality (1). Equality (2) is a standard result in Gröbner basis theory. Inequality (3) follows directly from the inclusion $G \subset I$ which implies the inclusion $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G) \subseteq \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I)$. Inequality (4) derives from the equalities $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$ and the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (0 : \overline{L}) \longrightarrow P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G) \xrightarrow{\overline{L}} P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G) \longrightarrow \hat{P}/LT_{\hat{\sigma}}(\widehat{G})) \longrightarrow 0$$

Finally, equality (5) is a consequence of the assumption that $\widehat{G}$ is a $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $I_L$. We deduce that all the inequalities are equalities, hence $\mathrm{HS}^a(P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I)) = \mathrm{HS}^a(P/\,\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G))$ which implies that $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I) = \mathrm{LT}_\sigma(G)$, hence $G$ is a $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$, and so claim (a) is proved.

Claim (b) follows from (a) and the fact that $\varphi$ substitutes $x_i$ with the linear polynomial $\ell$, and all the indeterminates in the support of $\ell$ are $\sigma$-lower than $x_i$. ☐

The following examples show the tightness of the assumptions in the above theorem.

**Example 2.12.** Let $P = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$ and let $\ell = x_4$, $L = x_2 - \ell = x_2 - x_4$. Let $\sigma$ be any degree-compatible term ordering, let $G = \{x_1^2,\ x_1x_3 - x_2,\ x_1x_4,\ x_4^2\}$, let $I$ be the ideal generated by $G$, and let $\widehat{G} = \{x_4^2,\ x_1x_3 - x_4,\ x_1x_4,\ x_1^2, \}$. We have

$$x_1^2x_3 - x_1(x_1x_3 - x_2) - x_1x_4 = x_1(x_2 - x_4) = x_1L \in I$$

which implies that $L$ divides zero modulo $I$, so that all the hypotheses are satisfied except one. And we see that $\widehat{G}$ is the reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $I_L$, while the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$ is $\{x_1^2,\ x_1x_3 - x_2,\ x_1x_4,\ x_4^2,\ \mathbf{x_1x_2},\ \mathbf{x_2^2}\}$ which is not $G$.

**Example 2.13.** Let $P = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$ and let $\ell = x_4$, $L = x_2 - \ell = x_2 - x_4$. Let $\sigma$ be any degree-compatible term ordering, let $G = \{x_2^2 - x_3^2,\ x_1x_2\}$, let $I$ be the ideal generated by $G$, and let $\widehat{G} = \{-x_3^2 + x_4^2,\ x_1x_4\}$. We observe that all the hypotheses are satisfied, except the fact that $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. And we see that $\widehat{G}$ is the reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $I_L$, while $G$ is not a $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$, since the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I$ is $\{x_2^2 - x_3^2,\ x_1x_2,\ \mathbf{x_2x_3^2},\ \mathbf{x_3^4}\}$.

In the following, we start investigating how to make explicit the lifting of Gröbner bases as described in Theorem 2.11.

**Assumptions 2.14.** *Let* $P = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$*,* $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$*,* $c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_n \in K$*,* $N \in \mathbb{N}$*. Moreover let* $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ *be distinct elements of* $K$*,* $\ell_k = \sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j + \gamma_k$*, and* $L_k = x_i - \ell_k$ *for* $k = 1, \dots, N$*. Then we identify* $P/(L_k)$ *with the polynomial ring* $\hat{P} = K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, n]$ *via the isomorphism induced by* $\varphi_{L_k}(x_i) = \ell_k$*,* $\varphi_{L_k}(x_j) = x_j$*.*

**Definition 2.15.** Under Assumptions 2.14 let $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_N \in \hat{P}$, let $g \in P$ be such that $\varphi_{L_k}(g) = \hat{g}_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, N$. Then $g$ is called a **common lifting** of $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_N$.

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let* $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_N \in \hat{P}$ *be polynomials of degree less than* $N$*.*

(a) *There exists at most one common lifting of degree less than* $N$*.*
(b) *In particular, if there is a common lifting* $g$ *such that* $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g) = \mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{g}_k)$ *for* $k = 1, \dots, N$*, then* $g$ *is the only common lifting of degree less than* $N$*.*

*Proof.* Claim (b) is an obvious consequence of (a). To prove claim (a) we observe that the linear polynomials $L_1, \dots, L_N$ are pairwise coprime. Therefore the Chinese Remainder Theorem (see [7, Lemma 3.7.4]) implies that all the common liftings of the $g_k$ differ by a multiple of $\prod_{k=1}^N L_{\gamma_k}$ which is a polynomial of degree $N$, hence the conclusion follows. ☐

A common lifting of degree less than $N$ may not exist, as the following example shows.

**Example 2.17.** Let $P = K[x, y]$, $L_0 = y$, $L_1 = y - 1$, $L_2 = y - 2$. Then let $\hat{g}_1 = x$, $\hat{g}_2 = x + 1$, $\hat{g}_3 = x + 4$, and observe that their degree is less than $N = 2$. We compute a common lifting and get $g = y^2 + x$, as the only one of degree less than 3. Therefore there is no common lifting of degree less than 2.

**Theorem 2.18. (Lifting Gröbner Bases)**
*Under Assumptions 2.14 with* $\ell_k = \sum_{j > i} c_j x_j + \gamma_k$*, we let* $\Pi = \prod_{k=1}^N L_k$*.*

(a) *If* $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ *are sufficiently generic, the reduced* $\hat{\sigma}$*-Gröbner bases of the ideals* $\varphi_{L_k}(I)$ *share the same number of elements and the same leading terms, say* $t_1, \dots, t_s$*.*
(b) *If* $N \gg 0$*, at least one of the* $L_k$ *does not divide zero modulo* $I$*.*
(c) *Let* $g_1, \dots, g_s$ *be the common liftings of the corresponding polynomials in the reduced* $\hat{\sigma}$*-Gröbner bases of the ideals* $\varphi_{L_k}(I)$*. If* $g_i \in I$ *and* $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(g_i) = t_i$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, s$ *then* $(g_1, \dots, g_s)$ *is the reduced* $\sigma$*-Gröbner basis of* $I$*.*

*Proof.* To prove claim (a), we let $a$ be a free parameter, let $L_a = x_i - (\sum_{j \neq i} c_j x_j + a)$, and let $I_a$ be the ideal $I + (L_a)$ in the polynomial ring $K(a)[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. The $\sigma$-reduced Gröbner basis of $I_a$ consists of $L_a$ and polynomials in $K(a)[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n]$. It evaluates to the reduced Gröbner basis of the corresponding ideal for almost all values of $a$ which implies that the ideals $\varphi_{L_k}(I)$ share the same leading term ideals (for a more general argument see also [6, Proposition 2.3]).

Claim (b) follows from the fact that each primary component of $I$ can contain at most one of the linear polynomials $L_k$, since any pair of them generate the unit ideal.

Claim (c) follows immediately from Theorem 2.11. ☐

**Remark 2.19.** If we want to use the theorem to compute a Gröbner basis of $I$, we need to verify that the polynomials $g_k$ have the correct leading term, and this is easy to do. We also need to verify that they are in $I$, and in general this limits the usefulness of the theorem. Nevertheless there are nice situations where this verification can easily be made. For instance, if already have a Gröbner basis $G$ of $I$ and we want to compute the reduced Gröbner basis of $I$ with respect to another term ordering, then checking that the $g_k$ belong to $I$ entails simply verifying that their normal forms with respect to $G$ are zero.

Another favourable situation is the following. If the ideal $I$ is known via a parametrization, then checking that the $g_k$ belong to $I$ requires only evaluating them at the parametric expressions of the coordinates. This topic will be explored in another paper. Here we limit ourselves to giving an example where the expected output is a single polynomial. We observe that in this case the hypotheses of the theorem can be considerably weakened.

**Example 2.20.** Let $S$ be the affine surface in $\mathbb{A}^3_{\mathbb{Q}}$ given parametrically by

$$\begin{cases} x &= s^5 - st^3 - t \\ y &= st^2 - s \\ z &= s^4 - t^2 \end{cases}$$

The implicit equation of $S$ can be computed using a standard elimination procedure. We do it in CoCoA and get the implicit equation $F = 0$ where $F$ is a polynomial of degree 14 whose support contains 319 power products. Using a procedure suggested by the theorem and the remark, we can slice the surface with several hyperplanes parallel to $z = 0$, compute the cartesian equation of the corresponding curve viewed as a curve in the affine plane, and then reconstruct the equation of the surface. This procedure computes the polynomial $F$ using approximately $\frac{1}{16}$ of the time used by the standard procedure.

## 3. Families of Schemes and the Hough Transform

The notation is borrowed from [4] and [7]. We start the section by recalling some definitions taken from [6]. We let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be indeterminates and let $\mathbb{T}^n$ be the monoid of the power products in the symbols $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Most of the time, for the sake of simplicity we use the notation $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. If $K$ is a field, the multivariate polynomial ring $K[\mathbf{x}] = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is denoted by $P$, and if $f_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_k(\mathbf{x})$ are polynomials in $P$, the set $\{f_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_k(\mathbf{x})\}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ is called a system of polynomial equations.

Moreover, we let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ be an $m$-tuple of indeterminates which will play the role of parameters. If we are given polynomials $F_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \ldots, F_k(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ in $K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]$, we let $F(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = 0$ be the corresponding **set of systems of polynomial equations** parametrized by $\mathbf{a}$, and the ideal generated by $F(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ in $K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]$ is denoted by $I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is the affine scheme of the $\mathbf{a}$-parameters, $R$ its coordinate ring, and $\mathcal{F}$ the affine scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}))$, then there exists a morphism of schemes $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$, or equivalently a $K$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : R \longrightarrow K[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$. The morphism $\Phi$ and $\mathcal{F}$ itself, if the context is clear, are called a **family of sub-schemes of** $\mathbb{A}^m$.

**Definition 3.1.** If $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{A}^m$ and $I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \cap K[\mathbf{a}] = (0)$ the parameters $\mathbf{a}$ are said to be **independent** with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, or simply independent.

**Definition 3.2.** Let $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ be a set of polynomials and let $F(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ define a family which contains the scheme defined by $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$. Then let $I = (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$, let $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) = (F(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}))$, let $\mathcal{F} = \mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}))$, let $\mathbb{A}^m$ be the scheme of the independent **a**-parameters, and let $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ be the associated morphism of schemes. A dense Zariski-open subscheme $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathbb{A}^m$ such that $\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is free is said to be an $\mathcal{F}$**-free** subscheme of $\mathbb{A}^m$ or simply an $\mathcal{F}$-free scheme.

**Assumptions 3.3.** *Let $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ be a dominant family of sub-schemes of $\mathbb{A}^n$ parametrized by $\mathbb{A}^m$. Then we let $\sigma$ be a term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$, let $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ be the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of the extended ideal $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{a})[\mathbf{x}]$, and let $d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})$ be the least common multiple of all the denominators of the coefficients of the polynomials in $G(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$.*

**Proposition 3.4.** *Under Assumptions 3.3 the open subscheme $\mathcal{U}_\sigma = \mathbb{A}^m \setminus \{d_\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = 0\}$ of $\mathbb{A}^m$ is $\mathcal{F}$-free.*

*Proof.* See [6, Proposition 2.3]. ☐

**Definition 3.5.** We say that $d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})$ is the $\sigma$**-denominator** of $\Phi$, that $\Phi_{|d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})}$ is the $\sigma$**-free restriction** of $\Phi$, and that $\mathcal{U}_\sigma$ is the $\sigma$**-free set** of the family $\mathcal{F}$. The set $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ is called the **universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of** $\mathcal{F}$.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Under Assumptions 3.3 the following conditions are equivalent.*

*(a) The **a**-parameters are dependent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.*
*(b) We have $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{a})[\mathbf{x}] = (1)$.*
*(c) We have $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) = \{1\}$.*

*Proof.* The equivalence between (b) and (c) is a standard (easy) fact in computer algebra, so let us prove the equivalence between (a) and (b). If the **a**-parameters are dependent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ then $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) \cap K[\mathbf{a}]$ contains a non-zero polynomial, say $f(\mathbf{a})$. Then $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{a})[\mathbf{x}]$ contains a non-zero constant, hence it is the unit ideal. Conversely, if $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{a})[\mathbf{x}] = (1)$ then we may write 1 as a combinations of polynomials in $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ wit h coefficients in $K(\mathbf{a})[x]$. Hence there exists a common denominator, say $f(\mathbf{a})$ such that $f(\mathbf{a}) = f(\mathbf{a}) \cdot 1 \in I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$, and the proof is complete. ☐

**Notation 3.7.** Let $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ be a dominant family of sub-schemes of $\mathbf{A}^m$. It corresponds to a $K$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : K[\mathbf{a}] \longrightarrow K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$. The dominance implies that the **a**-parameters are independent, therefore $\varphi$ is injective. If we fix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_m)$, i.e. a rational “parameter point” in $\mathbb{A}^m$, we get $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x}]/I(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x}))$, a special fiber of $\Phi$, hence a special member of the family. Clearly we have the equality $K[\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x}] = K[\mathbf{x}]$ so that $I(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x})$ can be seen as an ideal in $K[\mathbf{x}]$. With this convention we denote the scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{x}]/I(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x}))$ by $\mathbb{X}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{x}}$.

On the other hand, there exists another morphism $\Psi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^n$ which corresponds to the $K$-algebra homomorphism $\psi : K[\mathbf{x}] \longrightarrow K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$. If we fix a rational point $p = (\xi_1,\dots,\xi_n)$ in $\mathbb{A}^n$, we get a special fiber of the morphism $\Psi$, namely $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a},p]/I(\mathbf{a},p))$. Clearly we have $K[\mathbf{a},p] = K[\mathbf{a}]$ so that $I(\mathbf{a},p)$ can be seen as an ideal in $K[\mathbf{a}]$. With this convention we denote the scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a}]/I(\mathbf{a},p))$ by $\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}$.

**Definition 3.8.** Let $G = G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ be the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $\mathcal{F}$, listed with $\sigma$-increasing leading terms. The corresponding list of non constant coefficients of $G$ is denoted by $\mathrm{NCC}_G$ and called the **non constant coefficient list** of $G$. Moreover, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ then $\mathrm{NCC}_G(\alpha)$ is the list obtained by $\alpha$-evaluating the elements $\mathrm{NCC}_G$.

The main property of the non constant coefficient list of $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ is described as follows.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Under Assumptions 3.3, the correspondence between* $\{\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{U}_\sigma\}$ *and* $\mathrm{NCC}_G$ *which is defined by sending* $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$ *to* $\mathrm{NCC}_G(\alpha)$ *is bijective.*

*Proof.* First, we show that the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $\mathcal{F}$ specializes to the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of each fiber $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$. The reason is that when we specialize we do not affect the leading terms and we do not add new elements to the support of the polynomials involved. Then the conclusion follows from the fact that the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of an ideal is unique (see [4, Theorem 2.4.13]). ☐

Theorem 3.9 suggests the following definition.

**Definition 3.10.** Let $\mathcal{U}_\sigma$ be the $\sigma$-free set of $\mathcal{F}$, let $G = G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ be the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner of $\mathcal{F}$, and let $\mathrm{NCC}_G$ be the non constant coefficient list of $G$. Then the scheme parametrized by $\mathrm{NCC}_G$ is called the **$\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$**. If $\mathrm{NCC}_G = (\frac{f_1(\mathbf{a})}{d_1(\mathbf{a})}, \dots, \frac{f_s(\mathbf{a})}{d_s(\mathbf{a})})$, then the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$ is represented parametrically by

$$y_1 = \frac{f_1(\mathbf{a})}{d_1(\mathbf{a})}, \dots, \; y_s = \frac{f_s(\mathbf{a})}{d_s(\mathbf{a})}$$

which is called the **parametric representation of the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$**.

**Example 3.11.** Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ where $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) = (x^2 + a_1^2 x + a_1a_2y + a_2^2)$, and let $\sigma$ be a degree-compatible term ordering. Then $\mathrm{NCC}_G = (a_1^2, a_1a_2, a_2^2)$ and the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$ is the affine cone $\mathbb{X}_\sigma$ represented by $y_1 = a_1^2, y_2 = a_1a_2, y_3 = a_2^2$. Its defining ideal in $K[y_1, y_2, y_3]$ is generated by $y_2^2 - y_1y_3$. Since $\dim(\mathbb{X}_\sigma) = 3$ we deduce that parametric representation of $\mathbb{X}_\sigma$, the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$, provides a uni-rational representation of it.

Using Theorem 3.9 and the theory of Gröbner fans (see [9]), we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let* $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ *be a dominant family of sub-schemes of* $\mathbb{A}^n$.

- *(a) For every degree-compatible term ordering* $\sigma$*, the* $\sigma$*-scheme of* $\mathcal{F}$ *represents the generic fibers of* $\mathcal{F}$.
- *(b) The set of* $\sigma$*-schemes of* $\mathcal{F}$ *is finite.*

*Proof.* Claim (a) is a restatement of the theorem. Claim (b) follows from the theory of Gröbner fans which entails there is only a finite number of reduced Gröbner bases of the ideal $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$. ☐

**Remark 3.13.** We repeat the argument of Remark 1.7 in this context. We mean that the statement of the theorem does not imply that there is a bijection between $\mathcal{U}_\sigma$ and $\mathrm{NCC}_G$, as the following easy example shows. Let $I(a, x)$ be the ideal in $K[a, x]$ defined by $I(a, x) = (x^2 - a^2)$, and let $\sigma =$ `DegRevLex`. Then $\mathrm{NCC}_G = (-a^2)$. For $a = \pm 1$ we get the same fiber defined by $x^2 - 1 = 0$ and identified by $\mathrm{NCC}_G(1) = -1$. The reason is that the theorem treats $\{\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{U}_\sigma\}$ as a set. It means that if we have $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{X}_{\beta,\mathbf{x}}$ we view the two fibers as a single element of the set.

### *3.1. The Hough Transform*

We recall the definition of Hough transform (see [6, Definition 3.11]), and then the problem suggested by Remark 3.13 will be examined via the notion of Hough regularity.

**Definition 3.14. (The Hough Transform)**
We use Notation 3.7 and let $p = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{A}^n$. Then the scheme $\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}$ is said to be the **Hough transform** of the point $p$ with respect to the family $\Phi$. If it is clear from the context, we simply say that the scheme $\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}$ is the **Hough transform** of the point $p$ and we **denote it by** $\mathrm{H}_p$. We observe that if $p \notin \mathrm{Im}(\Psi)$, then $\mathrm{H}_p = \emptyset$.

**Definition 3.15.** The morphism $\Phi_{|d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})}$ is called Hough $\sigma$-regular or simply **Hough-regular** if for all $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{U}_\sigma$, the equality $\sqrt{I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{x})} = \sqrt{I(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x})}$ implies $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. It is called Hough $\sigma$-superregular or simply **Hough-superregular** if for all $\alpha, \eta \in \mathcal{U}_\sigma$, the equality $I(\alpha, \mathbf{x}) = I(\eta, \mathbf{x})$ implies $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. It is called **generically Hough-regular** (**generically Hough-superregular**) if the above properties hold true on a non-empty open sub-scheme of $\mathcal{U}_\sigma$.

The main link between Hough transforms and Hough regularity can be explained as follows.

**Remark 3.16.** In [6, Theorem 3.10], under the assumption that $\sigma$ is degree-compatible, it is proved that if $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{x}}$ are irreducible schemes and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \cap_{p \in \mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}} \mathrm{H}_p$ then $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{X}_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{x}}$, equivalently $\sqrt{I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{x})} = \sqrt{I(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x})}$.

Now, if $\Phi_{|d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})}$ is Hough-regular, $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbb{X}_{\eta,\mathbf{x}}$ are irreducible schemes, and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \cap_{p \in \mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}} \mathrm{H}_p$, then we have $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. It means that under these assumptions the fiber $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$ can be identified via the Hough transforms of its points.

The remark shows the reason why it is useful to detect Hough-regularity. In practice it is easier to detect Hough-superregularity.

**Corollary 3.17.** *Let $\mathbb{X}$ be the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- *(a) The morphism $\Phi_{|d_\sigma(\mathbf{a})}$ is Hough superregular (generically Hough superregular).*
- *(b) The map $\mathcal{U}_\sigma \longrightarrow \mathrm{NCC}_G$ which sends $\alpha$ to $\mathrm{NCC}_G(\alpha)$ is injective (generically injective).*
- *(c) The $\sigma$-parametric representation of $\mathbb{X}$ is injective (the $\sigma$-parametric representation of $\mathbb{X}$ is generically injective, i.e. provides a rational representation of $\mathbb{X}$).*

*Proof.* It follows from the definition of Hough superregularity and Theorem 3.9. ☐

This corollary allows us to use Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6 to detect Hough superregularity and generic Hough superregularity. In particular, Example 1.9 can now be viewed as an example of a Hough superregular morphism. The following example shows that Hough superregularity can be tricky to detect.

**Example 3.18.** Let $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^2$ be defined parametrically by

$$x = a_1 u^4, \;\; y = u^5, \;\; z = a_2 u^6$$

At first sight one would be tempted to say that this representation induces Hough superregularity. However, by eliminating $u$ we get generators of the ideal $I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$, and if $\sigma = \texttt{DegRevLex}$, the reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $I(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{a})[\mathbf{x}]$ is

$$G = (y^2 - \frac{1}{a_1 a_2} xz, \;\; x^3 - \frac{a_1^3}{a_2^2} z^2\})$$

The family is not Hough-regular as the following CoCoA-code shows.

```
R ::= QQ[a[1..2]];
S ::= QQ[t, a[1..2], e[1..2]];
K := NewFractionField(R);
Use P ::= K[x,y,z,u];
ID:=Ideal(x-a[1]*u^4, y-u^5, z-a[2]*u^6);
E:=Elim([u],ID);
RGB := ReducedGBasis(E);
NCC := NonConstCoefficients(RGB);RGB;
Use S;
IDelta := ideal([a[i]-e[i] | i In 1..2]);
IDC := IdealOfDoublingCoefficients(S, NCC, "a", "e", "t");
IsInRadical(IDelta, IDC);
--false
```

The reduced Gröbner basis of $E$ contains $e_2^5 - a_2^5,\ e_1^5 - a_1^5$ which suggest that the fifth roots of unity can be used to detect different values of the parameters which define the same fiber. For instance we observe that $\mathrm{NCC}_G = (-\frac{1}{a_1a_2}, -\frac{a_1^3}{a_2^2})$, so that if $\varepsilon$ is the primitive fifth root of unity, then $\mathrm{NCC}_G(\varepsilon^2, \varepsilon^3) = \mathrm{NCC}_G(-1,-1)$.

Moreover, we can represent the scheme associated to $\mathrm{NCC}_G$ by eliminating $a_1, a_2$ from the parametric equations $y_1 = -\frac{1}{a_1a_2},\ y_2 = -\frac{a_1^3}{a_2^2}$. We get the zero ideal. It means that the above parametric equations describe a morphism of an open subset of affine plane with coordinates $a_1, a_2$ to the corresponding open subset of the affine plane with coordinates $y_1, y_2$ which is not an isomorphism.

### 3.2. *The Dimension of the Hough Transforms*

In this subsection we concentrate our investigation on the dimension of the Hough transform. We start with an example which shows that the fact that $\Phi$ is dominant does not necessarily imply that $\Psi$ is dominant too.

**Example 3.19.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^4$ defined by the ideal

$$I = (x_1^2 - x,\ \ x_1x_2 - x_2,\ \ x_2^2 + a_1a_2x_1 - (a_1 + a_2)x_2)$$

We have the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathcal{F} \arrow[dl, "\Phi"'] \arrow[dr, "\Psi"] & \\
\mathbb{A}^2_{(a_1,a_2)} & & \mathbb{A}^2_{(x_1,x_2)}
\end{tikzcd}$$

It is easy to check that $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = 2$ and that $\Phi$ is dominant. However, if we perform the elimination of $[a_1, a_2]$ we get the ideal $(x_1^2 - x_1,\ x_1x_2 - x_2)$, which means that $\Psi$ is not dominant. In particular, the closure of the image of $\Psi$ is the union of the point $(0,0)$ and the line $x_1 - 1 = 0$ . We observe that the fiber of $\Psi$ over the point $(0,0)$ is the plane defined by $x_1 = x_2 = 0$ while the fibers over the points on $x = 1$ are pairs of lines defined by $x_1 = 1,\ \ x_2 = c,\ \ (c - a_1)(c - a_2) = 0$.

The above example justifies the reason why in the next proposition we need to consider the image of $\Psi$.

**Proposition 3.20.** *Using Notation 3.7 let $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$ be the closure of the image of $\Psi$, and let $\mathbb{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be an irreducible component of $\mathbb{X}$, let $p$ be the generic point of $\mathbb{Y}$, and let $\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}$ be the generic fiber of $\Phi$. Then we have*

$$\dim(\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}) + \dim(\mathbb{Y}) = \dim(\mathcal{F}) = m + \dim(\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}})$$

*Proof.* In the proof we use the notation Kdim to indicate the Krull dimension. We have the equality $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{Kdim}(K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}))$. Then we let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the prime ideal which defines $\mathbb{Y}$ so that $\dim(\mathbb{Y}) = \operatorname{Kdim}(K[\mathbf{a}]/\mathfrak{p})$. Since $\dim(\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p})$ and $\dim(\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}})$ are the Krull dimensions of the fibers of $\psi$ and $\varphi$ respectively, the claim follows from [8, Corollary 14.5]. ☐

**Corollary 3.21. (Dimension of Hough Transforms)**
*The following conditions hold.*

- *(a)* $\dim(\mathrm{H}_p) = \dim(\mathcal{F}) - \dim(\mathbb{Y}) = m + \dim(\mathbb{X}_{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}) - \dim(\mathbb{Y})$.
- *(b) If $\Psi$ is dominant and* $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = m$, *then* $\dim(\mathrm{H}_p) = 0$.
- *(c) If* $\dim(\mathrm{H}_p) = 0$ *and the generators of $I$ are linear polynomials in the parameters* $\mathbf{a}$, *then* $\mathrm{H}_p$ *is a single rational point.*

*Proof.* Claim (a) is just another way of reading the formula of the proposition. To prove claim (b) we observe that if $\Psi$ is dominant then $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{X} = \mathbb{A}^m$, hence $\dim(\mathbb{Y}) = m$, so we have $\dim(\mathrm{H}_p) = m - m = 0$. Claim (c) follows from the fact that the coordinates of the points in $\mathrm{H}_p$ are the solutions of a linear system. ☐

Let us have a look at an example.

**Example 3.22.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^5$ defined by the ideal $I$ generated by the two polynomials

$$F_1 = (x^2 + y^2)^3 - (a_1(x^2 + y^2) - a_2(x^3 - 3xy^2))^2; \quad F_2 = a_1 z - a_2 x.$$

If we pick a degree-compatible term ordering $\sigma$ such that $z >_\sigma y >_\sigma x$, then $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F_1) = y^6$, $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F_2) = z$ if $a_1 \neq 0$, and $\{F_1, \frac{1}{a_1}F_2\}$ is the reduced Gröbner basis of $I$. Using Proposition 3.4, we get $\mathcal{U}_\sigma = \mathbb{A}^2 \setminus \{a_1 = 0\}$ and we see that $\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_\sigma) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_\sigma$ is free. If we perform the elimination of $[a_1, a_2]$ we get the zero ideal, hence also $\Psi$ is dominant, actually surjective. Counting dimensions as suggested by the proposition, we see that $\dim(\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}) = 0$ for the generic fiber. Since $a_1, a_2$ are quadratic and related by a linear equation, the Hough transforms of the points in $\mathbb{A}^3$ are pairs of points. For instance, if we pick the point $p = (1, 1, 1)$, its Hough transform is the pair of points $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 1), (-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$.

**Example 3.23.** We modify the above example in the following way. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^5$ defined by the ideal $I$ generated by the two polynomials

$$F_1 = (x^2 + y^2)^3 - a_1((x^2 + y^2) - (x^3 - 3xy^2))^2; \quad F_2 = z - a_2 x.$$

If we pick a degree-compatible term ordering $\sigma$ such that $z >_\sigma y >_\sigma x$, then $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F_1) = y^6$, $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(F_2) = z$, and $\{F_1, F_2\}$ is the reduced Gröbner basis of $I$. Using Proposition 3.4 we see that $\Phi$ is free. If we perform the elimination of $[a_1, a_2]$ we get the zero ideal, hence also $\Psi$ is dominant, actually surjective. Counting dimensions as suggested by the proposition, we see that $\dim(\Gamma_{\mathbf{a},p}) = 0$ for the generic fiber. Up to here the situation is similar to the above example. But now the two parameters $a_1, a_2$ are linear in the polynomials $F_1, F_2$, hence the Hough transforms of the generic point in $\mathbb{A}^3$ is a single point as described in the proposition. It has coordinates $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ where

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{(x^2+y^2)^3}{((x^2+y^2)-(x^3-3xy^2))^2} \qquad \alpha_2 = \frac{z}{x}$$

*3.3. Hyperplane Sections and Hough Transforms*

The setting of this subsection is the following.

**Assumptions 3.24.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of sub-schemes of $\mathbb{A}^n$ parametrized by the affine space $\mathbb{A}^m$ and let $\Phi : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ be a dominant morphism which corresponds to an injective $K$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : K[\mathbf{a}] \longrightarrow K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$.*

**Assumptions 3.25.** *Let $L = x_i - \ell$ be a linear polynomial with $\ell = \sum_{j\geq i} c_j x_j + c$. Then we let $\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\imath}} = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$, identify $K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}]/(L)$ with $K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\imath}}]$ via the isomorphism induced by $\varphi(x_i) = \ell$, $\varphi(x_j) = x_j$ for $j \neq i$, and let $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L = \varphi(I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})) \subset K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\imath}}]$.*

**Notation 3.26.** The scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\imath}}]/I(\mathbf{a},x)_L)$ is called the **$L$-hyperplane section of** $\mathcal{F}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{F}_L$. The morphism $\mathcal{F}_L \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^m$ which corresponds to the $K$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi_L : K[\mathbf{a}] \longrightarrow K[\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\imath}}]/I(\mathbf{a},x)_L$ canonically induced by $\varphi$, is called $\Phi_L$. Then let $\sigma$ be a degree-compatible term ordering such that $x_1 >_\sigma x_2 >_\sigma \cdots >_\sigma x_n$, and let $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ be the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner of $\mathcal{F}$, let $\hat{\sigma}$ be the term ordering induced by $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ and let $G_{\hat{\sigma}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L$ be the universal reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner of $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L$.

**Proposition 3.27.** *Under Assumptions 3.24 and 3.25, suppose that $x_i$ does not divide any leading term of the elements of $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$.*

*(a) The basis $G_{\hat{\sigma}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L$ is obtained by replacing $x_i$ with $\ell$ in $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$.*
*(b) The **a**-parameters are independent with respect to $\mathcal{F}_L$.*

*Proof.* Claim (a) follows immediately from Theorem 2.9.a. To prove claim (b) we observe that the **a**-parameters are independent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ by assumption. Therefore $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) \neq \{1\}$ by Proposition 3.6 and so $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})) \neq (1)$. Theorem 2.9.c implies that $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L)$ has the same set of generators as $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}))$ which implies that also $\mathrm{LT}_{\hat{\sigma}}(I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L) \neq (1)$ and hence the conclusion follows from Proposition 3.6. ☐

The following example shows that without the assumption of the proposition, even if $\Phi$ is dominant, $\Phi_L$ needs not be such.

**Example 3.28.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of sub-schemes of $\mathbb{A}^4$ defined by $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) = (x^2 - a_1 y,\ y^2 - a_2)$. We check that $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) \cap K[\mathbf{a}] = (0)$, so we conclude that the parameters are independent. However if $L = x - y$, then $\mathcal{F}_L$ is defined by $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L = (y^2 - a_1 y,\ y^2 - a_2)$ and we have the following equality $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L \cap K[\mathbf{a}] = (a_1^2 a_2 - a_2^2)$ which means that the parameters with respect to $\mathcal{F}_L$ are not independent anymore.

An easy consequence of the proposition is that the non-constant coefficient list of $G_{\hat{\sigma}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L$ is easily deduced from the non-constant coefficient list of $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$. Let us have a look at an example which illustrates the proposition.

**Example 3.29.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the sub-scheme of $\mathbb{A}^7$ defined by the ideal $I(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ generated by the two polynomials

$$F_1 = a_1xy - a_2y^2 - w, \quad F_2 = a_2x^2 + a_3y^2 + z^2$$

We pick a degree-compatible term ordering $\sigma$ with the property that $x >_\sigma y >_\sigma z >_\sigma w$, and let $F_3 = y^3 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}yz^2 + \frac{a_1a_2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}xw + \frac{a_2^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}yw$. Then $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) = \{\frac{1}{a_1}F_1, \frac{1}{a_2}F_2, F_3\}$ is the universal reduced $\sigma$-Gröbner basis of $\mathcal{F}$. The leading term of $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ are $\{xy,\ x^2,\ y^3\}$ and hence $z$ does not divide any of them. Let $\ell = c_1w + c_2$ with $c_1, c_2 \in K$, $L = z - \ell$. Then claim (b) of the proposition implies that the substitution of $z$ with $\ell$ in $G_\sigma(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})$ produces the universal reduced $\hat{\sigma}$-Gröbner basis of $\mathcal{F}_L$. For instance if $\ell = w - 1$ we get $G_{\hat{\sigma}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x})_L = \{\frac{1}{a_1}F_1,\ \frac{1}{a_2}(a_2x^2 + a_3y^2 + (w-1)^2,\ \overline{F}_3\}$ where $\overline{F}_3 = y^3 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}y(w-1)^2 + \frac{a_1a_2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}xw + \frac{a_2^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}yw$. Consequently, we get the equality $\mathrm{NCC}_G = (-\frac{a_2}{a_1},\ -\frac{1}{a_1},\ \frac{a_3}{a_2},\ \frac{1}{a_2},\ \frac{a_1^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3}, \frac{a_1a_2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3},\ \frac{a_2^2-2a_1^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3},\ \frac{a_1^2}{a_2^3+a_1^2a_3})$. If we compute the elimination of $[x,y,z,w]$ from the ideal $(F_1,F_2)$ we get $(0)$, hence the parameters are independent. And if we compute the $\sigma$-scheme of $\mathcal{F}$ we get a scheme isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^3$.

**Remark 3.30.** We conclude the section by pointing out a potential application of the theory developed in the paper. Suppose we have the images of several parallel sections of a human organ, which is exactly what happens with various types of tomography. Then we try to identify the cross-sectional curves using Hough transforms. Once we have the equations of these curves, even for a small portion of the organ, we can try to reconstruct the equation of the whole surface using Theorem 2.18. This hot topic is under investigation.

## References

## References

[1] CoCoATeam, CoCoA: a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra. Available at http://cocoa.dima.unige.it.

[2] P.V.C. Hough, *Method and means for recognizing complex patterns*, US Patent 3069654, December 18, (1962).

[3] O. Duda, P.E. Hart, *Use of the Hough Transformation to Detect Lines and Curves in Pictures*, Comm. ACM, **15**, 11–15, (1972).

[4] M. Kreuzer, L. Robbiano, *Computational Commutative Algebra 1*, Springer, Heidelberg, (2000).

[5] M.C. Beltrametti, A.M. Massone and M. Piana, *Hough transform of special classes of curves.*, Preprint.

[6] M.C. Beltrametti and L. Robbiano, *An algebraic approach to Hough transforms* J. Algebra **371**, 669–681 (2012)

[7] M. Kreuzer, L. Robbiano, *Computational Commutative Algebra 2*, Springer, Heidelberg, (2005).

[8] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, (1995).

[9] T. Mora, L. Robbiano, *The Gröbner fan of an ideal*, J. Symbolic Comput. **6**, 183–208 (1988).